

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 through 16 and 19 through 21 are in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 16, and 20 having been amended, and claims 18 and 19 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 14, 16, and 20 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Objection

The abstract has been amended with regards to the Examiner's helpful suggestion.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,516,421 ("Peters"). Claims 11 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,536 ("Park"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 14, 16, and 20

Amended independent claim 1 describes a method comprising receiving from a user an affirmative indication via a peripheral device that the user is no longer using a system, and adjusting an original power policy of a processing unit in response to the received indication. The system comprises the processing unit and the peripheral device

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest the above-mentioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an affirmative indication via a peripheral device that the user is no longer using a system.

Peters, at column 3, lines 45 – 50, states that "The user may be prompted... or at some later time when the users task is deemed to be complete such as when the user indicates

completion by selection log off or shut down.” However, nowhere does Peters disclose an indication of a user task being completed based on anything other than a log off or shut down.

Accordingly, nowhere can Peters be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an affirmative indication via a peripheral device that the user is no longer using a system.

The remaining art of record has been reviewed and is not seem to remedy the foregoing deficiencies in Peters. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 14, 16, and 20 each disclose receiving an affirmative indication via a peripheral device that a user is no longer using a system. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claims 14, 16, and 20 and their related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

January 26, 2007

Date



Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982